

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 37, NO. 12

January 17, 1944

WHOLE NO. 988

THE LIBRARY OF  
CONGRESS

FEB 22 1944

## COMMENT AND CONJECTURE ON LUCRETIUS

Note on Lucretius 2.1174 (*DeGraff*); Moenia Mundi (*Else*); Notes on the Leonard and Smith Edition of Lucretius (*Hadzsits*); A Lucretian Topic of Consolation (*Stevens*)

## CLASSICAL ABUSE (Gavigan)

## REVIEWS

SHUSTER, The World's Great Catholic Literature (*Jacks*); CHERNISS, The Biographical Fashion in Literary Criticism (*Carver*)

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

---

---

## FIFTEEN GREEK PLAYS



*Translated into English by*

**Gilbert Murray, Benjamin Bickley Rogers, and others**

**With an Introduction and a Supplement from the 'Poetics' of Aristotle by**

**Lane Cooper**

793 pages

College edition \$3.00

Already adopted at: Goucher, Rockford, Northwestern Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, University of California at Berkeley, Pennsylvania State College, Fieldston School, University of Louisville, University of Denver, Duke, Cornell, Vassar, Wesleyan University, Boston University, Tufts, Gustavus Adolphus, Mt. Holyoke, Smith, Bernard School for Girls, Yale, Cedar Crest College, Wooster, Nazareth College, St. Joseph's College, Skidmore, Carleton, Houghton, University of Iowa, and others.

Write for an examination copy

**OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS**

NEW YORK, Inc.

114 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK 11, NEW YORK

---

---

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Franklin B. Krauss, Secretary and Treasurer, Box 339, State College, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Jotham Johnson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, or the District of Columbia, a subscription to CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to The Classical Journal) is included in the membership fee of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, whose members are also entitled to The Classical Outlook and The Classical Journal at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary-Treasurer.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 37 contains issues dated: October 4, 11, 18, 25; November 1, 15, 29; December 6, 13 (1943); January 3, 10, 17; February 7, 14; March 6, 13, 20, 27; April 17, 24; May 1, 8, 15, 22; June 5 (1944).

## MEMORANDA

A booklet which properly deserves review in CLASSICAL WEEKLY, except that no review could do it complete justice, has recently been issued as Volume 31, Number 12 of the Indiana University News-Letter. The whole issue is devoted to a paper by Cecilia Hennel Hendricks which is a biography and appreciation of Professor Lillian Gay Berry, "Roman Hoosier." Excerpts are unfair, but there are two sentences which especially delight the Editor of CLASSICAL WEEKLY. From the editorial comment of The Indianapolis Star on Professor Berry's work comes one, "even the students who flunked would vote for her in a 'Miss America' contest." On Miss Berry's retirement, the author remarks (27), "Most important, there will be uninterrupted time for scholarly pursuits. She has the proverbial barrel of unpublished manuscripts, needing only her editing to furnish material for magazine and book publication."

It is, above all, stimulating to see emphasis put on Miss Berry's superior teaching ability, but that emphasis would be far less convincing if it were not consistently shown that the subject of her teaching had a part in her success. We have all seen enthusiasm as keen as Miss Berry's sadly wasted or made ridiculous because the subject matter could not support it.

An illuminating addition to her contribution published in CLASSICAL WEEKLY November 29 (74) is sent by Dr. Margarete Bieber of Columbia University in the form of a newspaper picture published January 24 with a boldface caption *Acme Radiofoto Flashed Here Yesterday*. "Curious crowds" are pictured watching "van loads of art treasures from the Monte Cassino Monastery, guarded by Nazi troops, arrive at the Vatican in Rome for safe-keeping." Verification is offered by calling attention to the background, which shows the dome of St. Peter's and a buttress of Sant' Angelo.

A poster as attractive as it is stimulating is being circulated by Oxford University Press, New York. It

contains a statement by Malcolm Johnson under the interrogative caption, *Are Books Essential?* Every reader of classical literature will find it interesting in its entirety:

Today millions are deriving help, inspiration, courage and diversion from books. Books are saving priceless man hours by making available to all who can read all the skills of all the crafts so vital to victory. Books are explaining to a bewildered nation why we fight—how, and where, and whom we fight. Books reveal our friends, unmask our enemies. Books help us to understand our country, our world, the history, the geography, the people, their customs, their ambitions. Books take us where our men are fighting and make them better fighting men. Books give us all that mankind has done and dreamed and planned. Whatever man has accomplished or hopes to accomplish is yours in books. Are books essential? Try to imagine a democracy at war without books.

Neat design and superior treatment artistically enhance this text which so effectively itself knits together the utilitarian and the spiritual importance of literature.

An Associated Press dispatch dated January 19 brings unconfirmed news that the German occupants of Rome are troubled at the damage done to the eternal city's waterworks by an Allied air attack. The Germans' annoyance in this matter is in quaint contrast to the pleasure afforded Caelius Rufus when the shopkeepers interfered with the normal distribution of the public water supply. The occasion gave Caelius a chance to relieve his boredom with speech making (Frontinus, *De Aque*. 75-6). Rome, free from the dizzy complications of total war, was in Caelius' eyes all but asleep in 50 B.C. He remarks to Cicero, "I just can't tell you at what a low ebb things are here. If I hadn't exchanged a few blows with the shopkeepers and water companies, a lethargy would have enveloped the city" (Fam. 8.6.4). What comfort the modern invaders would have found had they come in the quiet days of the consulship of Paullus and Marcellus when the only excitement was some skullduggery between the "tabernarii" and the "aquarii."

C. HOWARD SMITH

LEISENRING, PENNSYLVANIA

The December issue of the Bulletin of the Pennsylvania Association of Classical Teachers is rich in statements of the importance of school Latin in today's education. Forceful and timely opinions, well phrased and well presented, represent school superintendents, a judge, a clergyman, and several classroom teachers. As could be expected, the last group have the clearest observations on the subject. Miss Cornelia O. Bowen, Bala Cynwyd Junior High School, for instance, declares, "The whole world is geared for destruction; I am happy to think that I am helping to preserve the heritage of the past—through the teaching of Latin." The climax of a careful and enthusiastic statement of Miss Mary Glowacki, Nanticoke High School, comes in, "A cultured mind shrinks from destruction, injustice and intolerance." This teacher has used Mr. Churchill's English style as a basis for a study of Latin style. Miss Helen Hersperger, Indiana High School, tells about former pupils who have used their knowledge of Latin

as a key to understanding the language of the Italian people, "while their younger relatives at home continue with 'basic training' in the traditional study of Latin" which, she says, "links the past of Caesar's day with the present of our soldiers who serve in England, Africa, Sicily, or Italy." Brother Aloysius, Central Catholic High School, Pittsburgh, puts a cogent question, "What is to become of the technically trained students of our high schools who in two years or less perhaps step out into a world of peace? . . . Can they then adjust themselves?" But perhaps the statement which will most appeal to readers of CLASSICAL WEEKLY is that of Mr. Oswald R. Kuehne, Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, so succinct that it can be quoted in full: "It would be difficult to get a better statement on this subject than that of Professor Krauss entitled War Aims of the Pennsylvania State Association of Classical Teachers. It is to be found on pages 18 to 21 in the CLASSICAL WEEKLY of October 11, 1943."

# COMMENT AND CONJECTURE ON LUCRETIVS

## Note on Lucretius 2.1174

1173 nec tenet omnia paulatim tabescere et ire

1174 ad scopulum\* spatio aetatis defessa vetusto

\*scopulum O    scopulum Q    capulum Vossius

Vossius' emendation of the manuscript reading has been generally accepted, though Merrill, whose text in his annotated edition (American Book Company 1907) reads *capulum*, reverted to *scopulum* in his critical text ten years later (University of California 1917: cf. Merrill, UCPCPh. January 27, 1916). In his earlier edition he explains *capulum* as vulgar Latin for *feretrum*; in his later, he complains that Vossius has introduced a Semitic metaphor by his emendation. It might be well to consider the weight of evidence for each of the two readings.

Lachmann, Kelsey, Lee, Munro, Bailey (in his translation), Ernout, Diels, Rouse and Martin all accept Vossius' *capulum*. P.W. interpret *ire ad capulum* as 'sterben,' D. & S. define *capulus* 'une espèce de cercueil.' As evidence for the use of the word, we may cite Servius (Aen. 11.64; 6.222), Nonius 4, Festus (Lindsay 53). The first three citations refer directly, the fourth less directly, but unmistakably, to Plautus' use of *capularis* (M.G. 628) and *capuli decus* (As. 892), where the former is used in conjunction with *Acheruntius* to mean 'having one foot in the grave' and the latter is used appositively with *carnufex* as a term of abuse. Both are quite obviously expressions of the vernacular variety used in jest by Plautus, the former like *Acheruntius* no doubt coined by him. Vergil uses *capulus* of hilt only; for bier he prefers the more dignified *feretrum* which he uses three times (in Aen.

11.149 where Servius has no note, as well as in the instances cited above). Lachmann, who admits that *capulus* as 'bier' is rare, cites Statius, Theb. 3.362, but neither Garrod (Oxford 1906) nor Klotz (Teubner 1908) accepts the reading in which *capulo* appears. The use of *capulos* in the sense of 'coffins' in Apuleius, Met. 4.18 may indicate that by a later date the word had come back to its Plautine sense. It seems fairly clear, however, that *capulus* as 'bier' was replaced early by the more respectable term *feretrum*, and that the Plautine examples used as the principal evidence for the emendation of Vossius have an indubitably strong vernacular and comic flavor.

As for *scopulum*, the manuscript reading, Lambinus's interpretation of the metaphor as one having to do with shipwreck is certainly plausible. Lucretius's contemporary, Cicero, certainly used *scopulus* in the sense of 'hazard.' In Rab. Perd. 9.25 we have the expression *ad eos scopulos appulisses* in a sentence that mentions also *navem afflictam* and *naufragium fortunarium*. In De Orat. 3.4.163 Cicero specifically approved of *scopulus* as a metaphor of danger (cf. also Terence, Phorm. 689; Cicero, Rosc. Amer. 29, 79; De Orat. 2.37.154). Vergil, who, as indicated above, uses both *capulas* (three times as 'hilt') and *feretrum* (three times as 'bier') uses *scopulus* much more frequently (33 times in his major works), as an observation which in itself proves nothing, but may be significant in view of the evidence.

A careful reading of Lucretius, Book II, seems to me to favor the interpretation which preserves the reading based on manuscript evidence. There is a constant conflict between the forces of birth and destruction *aequo*

. . . *certamine* (574). Death may be the result of a blow that disturbs the vital order of the atoms (944-53), cum aeternis succumbunt omnia plagis (1140; cf. also 3.440-4) or may result when bodies reach the limit of their growth and begin to decay (2.1131-8). The cycle of destruction may then be described both as *paulatim tabescere* (1173), a wasting away process, and as *ire ad scopulum* (1174), a more violent disruption of the ordered arrangement of the atoms. This seems at least as acceptable as the use of a strange metaphor involving a rare word (in its connotation of 'bier') of unmistakable vernacular associations. It would be tempting to take *scopulum* in the sense of 'goal' (Suetonius, Dom. 19), but there is no evidence that it was so used in the time of Lucretius, nor has Cicero's use of σκοπός (Att. 8.11.2) in that sense a bearing on the question.

THELMA B. DEGRAFF

HUNTER COLLEGE

### Moenia Mundi

Students of Lucretius must always have felt that the passion which burns so fiercely in his poem is the passion of a convert. Its intensity cannot be gainsaid by anyone who has read his work; and it does not at all resemble the calm conviction of a man who had been a life-long Epicurean.<sup>1</sup> Its further peculiarity is that it often flames most brightly in the driest passages of Epicurean physics, so that the arguments themselves, even when they are not illuminated by his incomparable descriptions, take on a passionate life. One cannot leave Lucretius without the vivid feeling that he gave to Nature an adoration out of proportion to her place in the Epicurean scheme, far beyond the purely negative, prophylactic value which Epicurus had ascribed to natural science. Yet for Lucretius, as for his master, the understanding of Nature is ultimately valuable as a release from fears and superstitions. The difference is not one of intention, it is one of feeling.

Such a release particularly deserves the name of conversion if it comes suddenly. This is not to deny that even a sudden conversion is usually preceded by a period of preparation, long or short, conscious or unconscious. But the great conversions which have been most decisive and most fruitful—St. Paul and St. Augustine are the best examples—are associated for the most part with a particular moment in time, and with a definite vision or experience so overmastering that it colors a man's imagination and shapes his convictions all the rest of his days. In that transcendent moment a whole life is melted in the crucible and recast.<sup>2</sup> The

moment may recur or not;<sup>3</sup> in either case it remains the center around which all past and future experience is organized, the luminous point from which everything else derives its meaning.

In the proemium to Lucretius's third book there is a passage (3.14-30) which seems to me to be the actual record of such a moment. The book begins with the praise of Epicurus as the bringer of light into darkness. Lucretius hails his master as a father and his writings as the staff of life, like that sweet food which the bees suck in the meadows; then he describes the vision that unrolls before him as Epicurus's philosophy (it was probably the work *On Nature*) proclaims aloud the nature of the universe.<sup>4</sup> Now the terrors of the mind flee away, the walls of the world part asunder, and the trembling disciple, or disciple-to-be, sees the world-process at work throughout the whole of the infinite void. There are the serene and unshakable dwelling-places of the gods, bathed in unclouded light; and nowhere, not even beneath the earth—for in the heightened clarity of the vision he sees through it with ease—appear the dark realms of Acheron. There is no Hell! The power of the whole serene and light-filled revelation is such that Lucretius thrills with godlike ecstasy.

The universe stretches in infinite, luminous majesty far beyond the bounds that man, in the poorness of his imagination, had seen fit to set upon it. The *moenia mundi* appear in another great passage in praise of Epicurus (1.66-79);<sup>5</sup> there too he is extolled as the man who first dared to break open the locked gates of Nature, who marched out far beyond the "flaming walls of the world" and ranged in imagination over the whole of the unbounded void, whence he returned victorious, bearing the secrets of what can and what cannot be. The flaming walls are the fiery sphere of the fixed stars, which in the Platonic-Stoic as well as in the

that in William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience* (London and New York 1902- ), Lectures IX and X. On the difference between gradual and sudden conversion, see esp. pages 183ff., 206ff. On the content and sensations of the experience itself, see pages 248-56; on its decisive effects, 256-8. See also James's chapters on "Mysticism," for the mystical experience is essentially the same; and cf. A. D. Nock, *Conversion* (Oxford 1933), esp. chaps. I, XI, and XIV (the latter on the conversions of Justin, Arnobius, and Augustine).

<sup>3</sup>Plato describes his own ultimate experience (Epist. 7.341c) as "a light kindled from a leaping fire, a light which, once born in the soul, feeds itself." That is, the experience endures or recurs. Plotinus has the supreme vision four times in six years: Porphyry, *Vita Plot.* 23.

<sup>4</sup>*Vociferari* may be more than mere phraseology. A voice that speaks appears in many visions: cf. "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" and Augustine's "Tolle, lege." See James, 217, 250.

<sup>5</sup>The similarity, not to say identity, of the two passages seems to me sufficient to refute Ludwig Edelstein's thesis (TAPA 71 [1940] 78-90) that 1.66ff. refers to some Pre-Socratic. In *Lucretius's experience*, if not in historical fact, it was Epicurus who first stormed the walls of the world and traversed the limitless void.

<sup>1</sup>The notion that Lucretius underwent an actual conversion is discussed with particular care by W. A. Heidel, *Zeitschrift für Religionspsychologie* 3 (1910), 377-402, esp. 396ff., who draws an elaborate parallel with initiation into the mystery religions, but not with historical cases of conversion.

<sup>2</sup>The classic treatment of conversion in English is of course



popular cosmology bounded this single world and imprisoned the spirit in its inescapable round of births and rebirths, rewards and punishments. In the vision these narrow bonds are burst, the gates are thrown open, and the awe-struck spirit sees for the first time the infinite world, made up of innumerable worlds, in which it lives. The vision is not a mere intellectual act, it is an actual seeing of the real universe that surrounds us.

Three sensations are uppermost here: light, infinite space, and indescribable joy. All three are characteristic of conversion and mystical experience.<sup>6</sup> Lucretius does not relate the vision as an historical occurrence at a particular moment; he tells it in the present tense. But he does relate it as his own vision. It is he, Lucretius, who sees the walls parting asunder, the light of outer space breaking through, and the world-process operating with serene uniformity throughout the whole. It is he who sees that there is no Acheron, and he who thrills with more than mortal ecstasy at all he sees. I believe that what Lucretius records here is the revelation which first opened his darkened eyes, and which recurs, with greater or less intensity, whenever he re-reads the divine message of Epicurus.

The revelation of infinite space has no intensity in itself; it can gain intensity only by contrast with what preceded it. We can see from the poem itself that Lucretius was a man of vivid, even painfully vivid, visual imagination. From his own descriptions we can easily believe that he had once been a prey to visions of Hell, of the dead, of monsters, perhaps even of angry gods.<sup>7</sup> The fear of death and the fear of the gods are the great enemies he set forth to subdue; he could not have fought them so relentlessly if he had not known their torments himself. His deliverance by Epicurus was a release from their darkness into the light of truth.

A vision such as Lucretius describes is necessarily a solitary, not a communal, experience. This is what sets him so much apart from his fellows in the Epicurean brotherhood and gives to his preaching of an objective doctrine so personal a note. The revelation apparently came while he was reading Epicurus, perhaps on one of those calm nights which he afterwards devoted to his writing (1.142), but surely while he was alone, for no other person is mentioned as sharing in it.

Furthermore, the vision is not of Epicurus himself or of the Epicurean life, but of the physical universe.

<sup>6</sup>Light figures in almost every one of the dozens of cases cited by James. The feeling of immensity is only less common; that of inexpressible joy, all but universal.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. 3.1011ff., Cerberus et furiae, etc. (there is a lacuna after 1011 or 1012, so that the description may have been much more circumstantial). The bitter characterization of the fear of Tartarus (3.37-40, surely the contrast with the "divine joy" in 28-30 is deliberate) bears the marks of personal experience; note esp. *nigrore*. For visions of the dead see 1.132-5, 4.37-41, 732-4 (ghosts and monsters mixed); of gods, or the angry heavens, 5.1218-40, 6.250-5, cf. 379-95. All Lucretius's descriptions of dreams are of electrifying vividness.

From all that Lucretius tells us of his master, even here, we do not get one scrap of human personality. The kindly, thoughtful Epicurus who tended his flock in the Garden does not figure in the disciple's imagination at all. The world itself as it was revealed to him by Epicurus's godlike mind is his passion and the real hero of the poem. That his experience was a sudden act of sight embracing the whole actual world, and not merely a supreme moment of understanding after long study of the doctrine, is suggested by the difficulties he sometimes encounters in managing Epicurus's arguments.<sup>8</sup> The vision was not an outgrowth of his philosophy; the philosophy was a rationalization of his vision.

But if the directness and suddenness of Lucretius's great experience was at times a handicap, it was also the source of his passionate strength; for it contributed to his evangelical task not only absolute conviction but a pervading clarity. Out of the vision of all Nature grew the poem on Nature, in which the various parts of the great theme are integrated, not as mere items in a conceptual scheme, but as real portions of a physical whole that has been seen once and for all in its wholeness. The convert had become a preacher as clear and powerful—though with a totally different message—as the Jew who, a century later, suddenly saw Jesus on the road to Damascus.

GERALD F. ELSE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

### Notes on the Leonard and Smith Edition of Lucretius

My review of this important new edition of Lucretius (The University of Wisconsin Press 1942) appears in *The Classical Journal*. Though it goes considerably beyond the average length of reviews, I could not there discuss many problems which this edition presents. Professor Leonard and Professor Smith have prepared an edition that will, inevitably, provoke discussion. The Introductions and the Notes will, I believe, arouse a new interest in the great Roman rebel.

"And what was the social and historical background in his revolt against religion?" The Essay<sup>1</sup> that follows this question is an excellent, brilliant *sketch* of a large problem and Leonard's conclusion that there was more folly—and, I should add, affection, too—than terror in contemporary Roman religious beliefs and practices is, I think, true enough—although it is important to remember that Roman religion (as intelligent Romans knew full well) was born of FEAR, was shot through and through with FEAR, that FEAR could and did surge up from profound depths at crises in Roman affairs, as

<sup>8</sup>See Giussani, *Studi Lucreziani* (Turin 1896), *Introd.* xxiii, and his notes on the poem, esp. on Book IV.

1C. IX (70-9).

Livy, Vergil, Ovid, Tacitus, and Statius bear witness. Lucretius was not fighting against windmills, nor was he imagining ghosts of the past; human sacrifice *might* be repeated. Although Lucretius was not writing Epicurus into his own document, not rewriting Epicurus at all; while Lucretius' violence, his vehemence, his fierceness are all personal qualities, he is not, I believe, giving expression to a past personal experience with FEAR. This is not the only or inevitable conclusion. His own emancipation from orthodox beliefs was complete—it was an emancipation from orthodoxy and an escape into a new religious belief and aspiration—the nature of which Leonard has described better than any predecessor. He has magnificently caught the real truth of Lucretius' religious vision and it is high time that this truth finds universal acceptance. And that escape of Lucretius into a new belief is sufficient to explain the attacks on FEAR. But I wish that the initial statement (72) had been phrased: "revolt against orthodox religion."<sup>2</sup> I wish that we had been told where Cicero makes the distinction between *religio* and *superstitio* to which Leonard refers (73) as so well known. Does he refer to De Natura Deorum 2.28.72, or to the Tusculan Disputations? The spiritual content of the Epicurean symbols was not, I believe, "vague" (78)—even for the folk mind. We cannot take the critical views of Cicero as expressing the truth, as the Epicureans saw the truth. I wish that Leonard had quoted Philodemus' *Περὶ Ἐὐσεβείας* on the ecstasy of one-ness with God. Is it correct to say of Lucretius (any more than of the orthodox) that he "merely assumes the gods" (78)? Nor has Leonard here (79) caught the full significance of the Invocation to Venus (cf., also, 25, 69). All these points require further elaboration than is possible here, and these comments of disagreement are intended rather to indicate the challenging nature of Leonard's writing than as carping criticism. They are a tribute to Leonard's courageous exposition.

On page 148, Leonard and Smith speak of the evidence of the "ancient" manuscripts and of the Lex Julia Municipalis. But they do not, it appears to me, have proper respect for MSS O and Q, nor do I find any reference to earlier discussions of these difficult problems of orthography, as those of Brambach and Ritschl, or to the discussion in CR 13, 1899, 116ff. by Professor C. D. Buck. Some of these questions were settled, I think, by Lachmann and Munro, whose expositions I have re-read with admiration.

I should like to discuss a few instances, at least, of orthographic variants, as they appear in this edition—more, of course, if that were possible here.

(1) c for qu

Leonard and Smith do not seem to me justified in reading co in 6.796: tempore co si odoratast co

<sup>2</sup>Cf. "This hater of religion. . ." (76).

menstrua soluit. Bailey, Diels, Ernout, Giussani, Lachmann, Martin, Merrill, Munro, Rouse, all read *quo*. Both MSS O and Q give us *quo*.

Again I should protest against the orthography of Leonard and Smith in 3.555, COD: esse homine, illius quasi cod vas esse videtur. Bailey, Diels, Ernout, Giussani, Heinze, Lachmann, Martin, Merrill, Munro, Rouse, all read *quod*. O and Q both err in their readings, respectively, of *vasse* and *vase*, but there is no reason for rejecting the obviously good reading of *quod*.

Likewise, there seems to me no good reason for cos in 3.570: sensiferos motus, cos extra corpus in auras. All editors cited above read *quos*, which we also find in MSS O and Q.

(2) qu for c

Likewise, Leonard and Smith seem to me to go, quite unnecessarily, out of their way in their preference for *quanlas* in 2.951 dispersamque foras per quaulas eiecit omnis. Not one of the editors I have cited above favors the eccentricity of *quanlas* for *caulas*, which we find in both O and Q. Leonard and Smith say (on page 149) "*quanlas* stands once for *caulas*." I wish that they had said where. Even if it be true, the one appearance of *quanlas* would hardly justify adoption of that reading here.

Similarly, in 2.316, I can see no excuse for the spelling of Leonard and Smith loquorum: saepe tamen motus, spatio diducta loquorum. O and Q agree on *locorum*, and the statement on page 149 is, I fear, insufficient without further reference: "*loquorum* appears once as the genitive plural of *locus*." All the editors I refer to above read *locorum*. Likewise, on 2.64 et qua vi facere id quogantur sit ollis (65 reddita mobilitas . . .) and on 2.935 non fieri partum nisi concilio ante quoacto Leonard and Smith say that *quogantur* (n. 275) and *quoacto* (n. 276) appear along with *cogantur* (n. 277) and *coacto* (n. 278);<sup>3</sup> but MSS O and Q do not agree on the orthography Leonard and Smith give us here at 2.64, 935, and not one of our editors has suggested such spellings in these two verses! I can see no justification whatever for this departure from the normal *cogantur* and *coacto*, to which we are accustomed and which we find in O.

At 1.1036 ex infinito suboriri quopia posset and 3.582 (= 597, Munro) quid dubitas quin ex imo penitusque quoorta, inasmuch as O reads *copia* and *coorta*, while Q has *quopia* and *coorta*, Leonard and Smith do not appear to me wise in the adoption of their readings;<sup>4</sup> cf. page 149 "quopia (n. 257) once takes the place of *copia* (n. 258); and *quoortum* (n. 259) is once used instead of *coortum* (n. 260)" (but where? That is the important thing.) . . . "*quoorta* (n. 279) and *coorta* (n.

<sup>3</sup>149 (n.275 2.64, n.276 2.935, n.277 2.156, n.278 3.487).  
<sup>4</sup>(n.257 1.1036, n.258 [6 vss. listed: 1.417, 2.267, 3.194, 4.511, 5.359, 6.511], n.259 2.1106, n.260 6.671, n.279 3.582, n.280 e.g., 2.306, 3.15).

280)." Is this true, at all, of *quoorta*? Certainly we should have the manuscript authority given. All our editors read *copia* and *coorta*. And at 3.198 we find *quontra*: ad quontra lapidum coniectum spicarumque.<sup>5</sup>

(3) COM, CUM

At 6.225 hunc tibi subtilem com primis ignibus ignem, too, Leonard and Smith go contrary to the readings long established by our editors and to which we have become accustomed. Bailey, Ernout, Diels, Giussani, Lachmann, Martin, Merrill, Munro, Rouse read *cum primis ignibus*, following O rather than Q, which has *com*. Leonard and Smith are not, I think, justified in this instance, while at 1.1077 there might be a question: nec quisquam locus est quo corpora com venerunt because of what we find in O: cōuetc. Bailey, Ernout, Giussani, Merrill, Munro, Rouse read *cum*; Lachmann and Martin have *com*. Variants of the conjunction, *quom*, *com*, and *cum*, certainly appear, as Leonard and Smith observe (136),<sup>6</sup> and it is difficult enough to decide in every case, as, e.g., at 2.194, where O has *com* and Q reads *cum* (the very reverse of the prepositional spelling at 6.225). It is not surprising that unanimity among editors does not appear at this verse: *quom*, *com*, *cum* appear! All that we can ask for is some consistency throughout each editor's text. Leonard and Smith are not, as I see it, properly cautious and their reading at 1.135 again illustrates my criticism, c for qu: morte obita corum tellus amplectitur ossa.

Inasmuch as O and Q both read *quorum*, why should Leonard and Smith depart from the reading of these manuscripts which we find adopted without question or hesitation by all leading editors? Leonard and Smith read *corum* at the following points: 1.135, 467; 3.316; 4.116;<sup>7</sup> they read *quorum*, e.g., at 1.153, 188, 242 (see page 150). I do not find any principle that guided them in their demonstrations of the unquestioned "fluidity of diction and orthography" prevalent in the first century B.C. I wish that the Text had not been so deformed and that variant spellings might have been relegated to Notes. I wish that I might discuss *capud* (for *caput*), *quod* (for *quot*), forms of *ecus* (for *equis* or *equos*), and especially *loquella*.

I should disagree with Leonard and Smith in their reading *tendere* at 1.66, for *tollere*: primum Graius homo mortalit tendere contra est oculos ausus. Non. M. does not seem to me a good witness for this reading against the authority of MSS O and Q (in fact, of all MSS), which clearly give us *tollere*. The Aeneid

<sup>5</sup>See p. 150." All that we find there is: "Among adverbs one finds *condam* as well as *quondam*, *quontra* and *contra* . . ." (n.304 3.198, n.305 e.g. 1.66, 67, 82, 113). But is this argument or proof or valid reason for their choice?

<sup>6</sup>136; (n. 101) *quom*, 1.282, 2.477, etc. Merrill has *quom* and *quom*; Munro has *quam* and *quom*; (n.102) *com* 1.1077 Merrill has *cum*, Munro has *cum*, 2.194 e.g. Munro reads *quom* —n. in Munro, *quom* Nicc. com A Lach. cum B, etc.

<sup>7</sup>4.116. Of the various proposed restorations of this verse, I like the *corum* of Lach. and of Leonard and Smith least.

passage (2.405 Cassandra) ad caelum tendens ardentia lumina frustra appears to confirm the reading *tendere*, but no proof whatsoever lies in this apparent parallel. Vergil (cf. also Aen. 1.205) had his reasons for using *tendens* of the frantic Cassandra, but Lucretius is speaking of a calm philosopher, perhaps Epicurus. Lucretius' use of *tendere* (at 1.324 and 4.325) where the idea of strain again is present, as in Vergil,<sup>8</sup> does not establish *tendere* as the reading of 1.66; other words were available to Lucretius' choice. And I much prefer Munro's sane view to that of Leonard and Smith in spite of the fact that Lambinus and Lachmann had decided in favor of *tendere*, as Diels and Martin did after them.

The strikingly original reading proposed for 4.79, scenai speciem, *speciem* patrum atque decores, adds, I think, very interesting possibilities to the many suggestions that have already been advanced for the restoration of the text of this verse and will hold its own against competitors. But I fail to see the originality that is claimed for the reading of another very difficult verse, 5.881 (see Preface, page v). And at 2.42-3, I cannot agree that the discredited †epicuri † is a likely reading or that there is justification for reprinting the jumble † itastuas † in the text.

While I have discussed these few passages, expressing dissent, I decidedly wish to express my admiration for the care that has been bestowed by the editors upon innumerable spellings and readings, hundreds of which I have followed with a view to learning the reasons that impelled Leonard and Smith to make their choice. The editors' meticulous care is obvious; they have expressed their concern for their ideal text (128, 119 "each word"), and time alone will tell to what extent Lucretian scholars will follow in their footsteps. At least this Text is a challenge that all must meet.

GEORGE DEPUE HADZSITS

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

## A Lucretian Topic of Consolation

Suave, mari magno turbantibus aequora ventis,  
e terra magnum alterius spectare laborem;  
non quia vexari quemquamst iucunda voluptas,  
sed quibus ipse malis careas quia cernere suave est.

These lines describe a kind of consolation with which in a period of war and rationing we have become all too familiar. I propose to discuss briefly their place in the commonplace of consolation. There is still wanting a complete treatment of the topics of consolation. Buresch, in his *Consolationum* . . . *Historica Critica*, promised such a work in a second volume, and briefer treatments appear in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (s.v. Consolation, by W. Kroll), and in Pauly-Wissowa (s.v. Consolatio ad Liviam, by

<sup>8</sup>Cf. Aen. 6.202 (*tollunt*) vs. 6.239 (*tendere*), Hor. Ep. 1.1.28.



Skutsch). The latter lists thirteen topics, none of which happens to be the one Cicero (T.D. 3.79) called "illa . . . firmissima consolatio . . . non tibi hoc soli." This almost proverbial topic (cf. Wecklein at E. Med. 1017f.) was put to a witty use by one Theocritus, who, when he saw the bereaved gorging himself at the funeral feast, remarked, "Buck up, good fellow! Not unto you alone has this befallen" (Stob. 5.1132).

Under the heading "non tibi hoc soli" may be classified all the topics of consolation which imply a comparison of one's own plight with that of others. One would be the very common comparison of one's misfortune with that of a divine or heroic person, the classic illustration of which is Achilles' attempt to console Priam with the story of Niobe (Iliad 24.602ff.). Sometimes the comparison is with the troubles of famous men (Lucretius 3.1025ff.) or with those of members of the imperial family (Seneca, Cons. Polyb. 17). Or it may be with the fate of cities and nations (Servius ad Cicero, Fam. 4.5.4; Menander, Rh. Gr. 3.414.7f.). It may be simply with the fate of all mankind and thus fall into Skutsch's third topic, "tendimus huc omnes" (Cons. ad Liv. 359). These topics would pertain especially to bereavement, but the literature of consolation includes topics applicable to misfortunes of all sorts (cf. e.g., A. Giesecke, *De philosophorum veterum quae ad exilium spectant sententiis*). A fragment of Timocles (CAF 2.453) dilates upon the consolations offered by tragic spectacles. There the poor man can see a Telephus poorer than himself, the mad man a madder Alcmaeon, the sufferer from poor eyesight a blind Phineus, the bereaved mother a Niobe, the cripple a Philoctetes, and the hapless old man an Oeneus. In each case the sufferer will depart lightened of his own troubles.

Like the fragment of Timocles the Lucretian passage we have quoted pertains to consolation derived from the reflection that others are or have been worse off than oneself. This subtopic of the more inclusive "non tibi hoc soli" is distinguished by Plutarch from that in which the sufferer is consoled by the thought that others are as badly off as he is (Cons. ad Apollonium

8-9). Seneca drags this topic in by main force when he writes to a friend that he might be worse off: he might have lost a friend instead of a little son (Ep. 99.2-3)!

The harshness of the Lucretian passage is in part due to its proverbial source (cf. AJPh 62.428) and in part peculiar to this topic. Carneades urged that consolation drawn from the contemplation of the troubles of others was adapted to the uses of the malevolent (Cicero, T.D. 3.60f; cf. Seneca, Cons. Marc. 12.4-5). Cicero, though elsewhere he admits that such consolation is "vacant chaff well meant for grain" (Fam. 6.3.4) is, probably following Antiochus, his source for Carneades' criticism of the topic (T.D. 3.59), when he proceeds to defend the consolatory topic on the ground that sorrow is so serious a disorder that it warrants the application of a drastic therapeutic. A modern writer, Winifred Holtby, is of the same opinion ("Sons of Consolation," London Nation 45.430-1):

There are griefs which nothing but the bracing tone of malice can alleviate; there are nights so dark that nothing but the contemplation of a deeper, but artificial, darkness can illuminate them. . . . Housman, not Oxenham, is the consoling poet.

The details of Lucretius's consolation are set forth elsewhere (3.830ff.), where we learn that the Epicurean's more fortunate condition lies in the fact that death is nothing to him, whereas others are driven by the fear of death to labor vainly in the darkness that life is (2.54) for power and wealth which, even when won, can bring only pain and discontent (2.11-61; 3.59-82). This fear is inspired by vain terrors (Buresch, 7 n. 5 and 97-8, cites Democritus, fr. 297 D4, Plato, Ap. 40B, etc.) and can be dispelled only by a knowledge of *naturae species ratioque* (2.61). But if, having won this knowledge, the philosopher takes pleasure in watching the turmoil below him, the consolation thus gained is not invidious, inasmuch as he has devoted his life to the task of rendering his own security accessible to such as will accept its discipline.

EDWARD BOUCHER STEVENS

DEPAUW UNIVERSITY

### CLASSICAL ABUSE

It is sometimes the unfortunate lot of men who are great in their own right to be remembered by posterity chiefly because of their unfortunate relations with a greater man. Rufinus in his relations with Jerome is an example from Christian antiquity. Aeschines in his relations with Demosthenes is an example from pre-Christian antiquity.

The subject of these few lines is one who rose from poverty to influence in public life but who had the misfortune to cross swords with the greatest orator of history. After a brief introduction on Aeschines himself we shall consider part of the attack launched on him by his greater rival in his greatest speech.

Aeschines was born in the year 389 and died in 314. He was poor in possessions but rich in talents which he cleverly employed through a varied career until he finally rose to high position. His father was probably a schoolmaster, and it seems that Aeschines helped by working in the school.

When he was old enough for military duty he took part in several campaigns. He was in the battles of Mantinea and Tamynae. For bravery in the latter battle he was awarded a crown and was chosen as the first to bring home the news of victory.

Further fields of activity were opened to Aeschines when he became an actor, but it seems that he did not



attain much distinction in this occupation. As a magistrate's clerk he gained familiarity with the legislative and executive affairs of Athens. Finally he became secretary to the political leaders, Aristophon and Eubulus, who helped him to election to a post as government secretary.

His real talent appeared when, about the year 348, he had the chance of addressing the public. He rapidly improved his legal and political knowledge and developed as an impressive orator. His ability now led to further positions.

In 348 he was sent to the Peloponnesus to arrange a union of the Greeks against Philip. In the same year he was one of the ten ambassadors sent to Philip to discuss terms of peace. Early in 346 Aeschines and Demosthenes were members of another embassy to Philip. In the next year Demosthenes accused Aeschines of misconduct, charging him with treason and bribery. Aeschines cleared himself both on this occasion and again two years later when Demosthenes renewed the charge in his great speech *On the False Embassy*.<sup>1</sup>

In 336 Ctesiphon proposed that Demosthenes be granted a golden crown as a reward for his services to the state. Aeschines immediately attacked Ctesiphon for making an illegal proposal. The case was not tried until 330. Aeschines, in his speech *Against Ctesiphon*, made a fierce attack upon the whole public career of Demosthenes. In his own defense Demosthenes delivered his immortal oration *On the Crown*. Replying to the charges which Aeschines had hurled against him, he retorted with compound interest. Not content with merely rebutting the attacks against himself, Demosthenes threw himself with vigor and venom into a counterattack on Aeschines. As a sample of what a classical orator deemed the proper way to attack an opponent, the following citations are selected from Demosthenes' *De Corona*.<sup>2</sup>

The family of Aeschines is attacked (122):

You shout aloud, as if from a cart, epithets fit and filthy, which attach to you and your family, but not to me.

His family and his birth receive another thrust in a later passage (242), and at the same point a few choice epithets are applied to his character and abilities:

Men of Athens, vicious, vicious and evil-eyed and litigious as the traducer always is and under all conditions, this manikin is vermin born, a creature that has done nothing wholesome, nothing liberal from first to last, an ape of the true tragedy-type, a country fair Oenomaus. . .

The positions held by Aeschines are held up for ridicule and unfavorable comparison with those of Demosthenes (265):

<sup>1</sup>Trevelyan, *History of Ancient Civilization* (Harcourt, New York 1936), 393, notes that both orators handled the truth carelessly on this occasion.

<sup>2</sup>All citations made here are from the Simpson-Donnelly edition, Fordham University Press, New York 1941.

Examine, therefore, side by side, the incidents of your life and mine, Aeschines, calmly, not cruelly; and then ask your hearers whose fortune each of them would choose. You taught letters, and I went to school. You initiated, and I was initiated. You were a clerk, and I was a member of the assembly. You were third actor, and I was spectator. You worked in all your public life in behalf of our enemies, and I on behalf of our country.

The unflattering picture of Aeschines that is presented (284) makes of him a criminal and a traitor:

. . . you had been hired to ruin the interests of these my countrymen. Yet, nevertheless, although you yourself have been so manifestly detected as a traitor, and, lured by the course of events, have turned evidence against yourself, you dare to rail against me, and taunt me with crimes of which you will find anyone else more guilty than I am.

If we are to believe Demosthenes (198), Aeschines has always been disloyal and worse than useless as a statesman:

You prove your disloyalty too by your life, your conduct, your political action, and, negatively, by your political inaction. Is any measure which you think expedient to you in process? Aeschines is dumb. Has a check been received, or has something turned out amiss? Aeschines is to the fore, just as old ruptures and sprains come to life when a malady takes the body.

Aeschines is branded (263) as cowardly, criminal, and unpatriotic:

You chose such a public life, when at length it occurred to you to engage in this career also, that, as its consequence, when, on the one hand, your country enjoyed good fortune, you lived the life of a hare, fearful and trembling and always expecting to be struck for the crimes of which you knew yourself guilty; while, on the other hand, where the rest of the nation were unfortunate, you have shown a bold face to the world.

Demosthenes cleverly ties up his own cause with that of the audience (207) by suggesting that Aeschines is jealous of the glory due to the Athenians:

. . . my opponent, on the contrary, by assailing our whole policy, and bidding you be embittered against me as the cause of panic and peril to the state, thirsts apparently to deprive me of my momentary honour, but really tries to steal from you an immortality of glory.

After the epithets we have already noticed, the representation of Aeschines (159) as responsible for Athenian misfortunes will probably seem tame and restrained in spite of its importance to the oration:

. . . my opponent here, whom, if I must speak the truth without any reservation, I should not hesitate to call the universal bane of all we subsequently lost, men, districts, and cities. For he who provided the seed is responsible for the crop of mischief. I marvel that you did not turn with loathing from him the first time you saw him: unless it be, as it appears, that a certain great darkness lies about you, screening the truth.

One final point: I strongly suspect that Aeschines, unquestionably a first-class orator, felt the cruel sting of pride mortally wounded, when Demosthenes presumed to end his list of abusing titles (242) with the cutting appellation *παράσημος ῥήτωρ* 'an orator in counterfeit!'

JOHN J. GAVIGAN

VILLANOVA COLLEGE

## REVIEWS

**The World's Great Catholic Literature.** Edited by GEORGE N. SHUSTER. xv, 441 pages. Macmillan, New York 1942 \$3

This is an excellent book in spite of a few misprints. The editor has divided it into seven sections, Early Church (3-30), Middle Ages (33-95), Early Renaissance (99-107), Religious Humanism (111-71), An Expanding Faith (177-210), The Nineteenth Century and After (215-310), Modern Creative and Critical Writing (313-439).

Let me say at the outset I fully agree with the editor's two premises tacitly assumed, namely that there is great literature of a Catholic nature, and that a collection of its most striking examples is well worth while. He has produced fine work, and handled it with great scholarship. In some respects an anthology is most difficult to review. "De gustibus," and there's no use in going farther. But I will say this; when the second edition comes out, if there are slightly fewer selections, and those chosen are slightly longer, and there is a little running commentary from chapter to chapter, the work would show more clearly how the impact of Catholic thinking shaped, guided, encouraged or repressed certain literary tendencies. The author did not mention the kind of impact the Inquisition had on some sorts of writers.

For his Early Church which apparently ends about 430 A.D. he has nineteen selections from eighteen sources. St. Matthew is represented by the "Eight Beatitudes," St. Mark by his stark description of the Crucifixion, Eusebius by the Martyrdom of Polycarp, St. Augustine by the touching passage that describes the death of Monica. President Shuster could have done better than the Wright translation of St. Jerome (Cf. CPh 31.179, and CR 48.223 for American and British agreement on Wright's incompetence).

The selections per se are good. But in comparison with some of the giant figures omitted some of his choices look small. Basil the Great, Athanasius, and the Gregories are among the missing, as are many fine writers in the West.

I wish the author had included St. Basil's essay "To the Young Men," an exhortation to the study of the pagan classics superbly translated by Dean Deferrari in the Loeb. St. Cyprian's letters have many quotable passages. St. Ambrose wrote a stirring story of his struggle with Valentinian. Pope Gregory the Great left some powerful short letters on his life and times, the glittering Byzantine court, the Lombards in Italy, the conversion of the Angles. None of these gets a hearing.

Considering how largely the classics have bulked in Catholic education, and that the first period of fruitfulness in the Catholic Church is the Patristic, the 27 pages allotted to the Early Ages are disproportionately

few. Cyprian, Augustine, Ambrose, Paulinus of Nola, Jerome and Gregory the Great shaped Catholic influences in the West, just as Basil, Athanasius and the two Gregories and Chrysostom gave them tone in the East. The author says his book is not a mere anthology but a collection of passages designed "to illustrate the impact of Catholic thought and feeling upon world literature since the days of the Apostles." But if it were not for the men mentioned there would have been less impact—perhaps none. Of the Westerners only Augustine and Jerome find space, the latter in an unfortunate translation, of the Easterners only Chrysostom, and he whose works fill some thirteen big volumes in the Migne, and who wrote many a passage of power and of pathos, is allotted about one page! By an exquisite irony the topic of that one page is "vanity of vanities, all is vanity!"

The Mediaeval period, early Renaissance, and Religious Humanism fare better. Sts. Benedict, Bernard, Bonaventure and others appear, as well as Jacobus de Voragine, Roger Bacon, Venerable Bede, Malory, Froissart, Thomas a Kempis, Ruysbroek, Castiglione, Vasari, Gerson, Cervantes, John Fisher, and many more. A very representative and very catholic selection. Thomas a Kempis has six passages cited. No other writer is so distinguished.

The last three sections again embody an immense amount of study. President Shuster was shrewd in his decision to avoid living authors. He saved himself endless arguments there. A list including St. Francis de Sales, Dryden, Peguy, Schlegel, Manzoni, Conrad, Raymond, Hello, Heywood Broun, and G. K. Chesterton needs but little help.

There are few passages that do not lead to reflection, and many prompt a reader to seek further and to wish some of the sketches were longer. Altogether, 178 sources are used, with 208 selections. There has been a great deal of searching off the beaten track. This is not always an unmixed blessing. The hunt for novelty sometimes leads to the exclusion of good standard writers. Many of the authors quoted will be entirely new to a majority of readers. Yet some are worth while.

There is a finely phrased introduction by William Lyon Phelps which is a stimulus by itself.

L. V. JACKS

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY

**The Biographical Fashion in Literary Criticism.** By HAROLD CHERNISS. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1943 (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Volume 12, No. 15, pages 279-92) \$0.25

Professor Harold Cherniss in his admirable essay takes exception to the current stress upon the biographical approach in the interpretation of literature. Justly pointing out that such matters as the sale of a

house belonging to John Milton, the number and character of the wives of Euripides, the journey Plato made to Syracuse in 367—pointing out that details like these throw but little light upon the work of these men; indicating the weakness of Professor Wilamowitz's contention that "The philologist is once for all an interpreter, but not interpreter of the words alone. Then he will never completely understand if he does not understand the soul from which they come"; and showing the absurdity of thinking that one must re-create himself to take on the perceptibilities of the poet's original audience, Professor Cherniss, after presenting ample evidence in addition, concludes that "It is not important what the poem is made out of but what it is made into; and so too the external incidents of the author's life have meaning only as they are assimilated to his personality, and literary significance only so far as they have been transmuted by that personality into artistic form."

With this thesis there can be no quarrel. It may be possible, however, to use it as a springboard into certain speculations.

Although the matter of the article is limited, naturally, to classical literature, the scope, at least by impli-

cation, is more inclusive. The question arises, therefore, is biography never contributory in interpretation?

Classical literature differs from that of the great Romantic Period, for instance, very widely in that the latter is the expression of intense individualism. The Iliad and the Odyssey stand forth clearly, their meaning apparent to one whether or not he ever heard of the debate concerning the existence of Homer. Are the poems in Lyrical Ballads equally clear to one having no knowledge of Wordsworth and Coleridge? And what of the works of Keats, Byron, and Shelley, iotacists to an extreme degree? But many instances of poets who lived before the Romantic Period occur. The work of John Donne comes into sharper focus for one who is aware of the poet's life experience, especially of his preoccupation with science. Alexander Pope's attitude throughout his writing is more easily understandable if one remembers his bodily suffering. As a towering exception, of course, one grants that the plays of Shakespeare are beyond any necessity of biographical explanation. Can it be that the greater the work the smaller the need to know the details in the life of the author?

GEORGE CARVER

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

# RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Compiled by Lionel Casson and Bluma L. Trell from such bibliographical publications as reach this country, and from books received at the editorial offices. Prices have not been confirmed.

## ANCIENT AUTHORS

**Aeneas Silvius.** The Commentaries of Pius II, Books II and III. Translated by FLORENCE ALDEN GRAGG. 291 pages, Smith College, Northampton 1943

**Aeschylus.** TURYN, ALEKSANDER. The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus. v, 141 pages. Herald Square Press, New York 1943 (Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America Series, No. 2) \$3

**Aristophanes.** EHRENBURG, VICTOR. The People of Aristophanes. A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy. 332 pages, 19 plates. Blackwell, Oxford 1943 25 s.

**Aristotle.** The Poetics of Aristotle. Translated and edited by PRESTON H. EPPS. 70 pages. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill 1943 \$0.50

— GUTHRIE, W. K. C. Aristotle, On the Heavens. xxxvi, 378 pages. Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1943 (Loeb Classical Library) \$2.50

— Aristotle on Man in the Universe. Edited by LOUISE ROPES LOOMIS. Classics Club, New York 1943

**Athenaeus.** NYIKOS, LAJOS. Athenaeus quo consilio quibusque usus subsidiis Dipnosophistarum libros composuerit. 117 pages. Friedrich Reinhardt, Basel 1941

**Bede.** LAISTNER, M. L. W. and H. H. KING. A Hand List of Bede Manuscripts. 168 pages. Cornell University Press, Ithaca 1943 \$3

**Cicero.** TROUARD, SISTER MARY ALEXADIA. Cicero's Attitude towards the Greeks. iii, 104 pages. Chicago 1942 (University of Cicero dissertation)

**Dionysius Halicarnassus.** CARY, EARNEST. The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus with an English Translation on the Basis of the Version of Edward Spelman. IV. Books 6-7. 385 pages. Harvard University Press, Cambridge; Heinemann, London 1943 (Loeb Classical Library) \$2.50

**Erasmus.** VAN LOON, HENDRIK WILLEM. The Praise of Folly by Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam with a Short Life of the Author. xx, 255 pages. Walter J. Black, New York 1942 (Published for the Classics Club)

**Gregory Nazianzen.** HENRY, SISTER ROSE DE LIMA. The Late Greek Optative and its Use in the Writings of Gregory Nazianzen. xix, 108 pages. Catholic University Press, Washington 1943 (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. LXVIII) \$2

**Homer.** HART, WALTER MORRIS. High Comedy in the Odyssey. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1943 (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Volume 12, No. 14, pages 263-78) \$0.25

— The Odyssey of Homer in the English Verse Translation of Alexander Pope, illustrated with classical designs of John Flaxman. 373 pages. Heritage Press, New York 1942 \$3.75

**Josephus.** MARCUS, RALPH. Josephus, with an English translation in nine volumes. VII. Jewish Antiquities, Book XII-XIV. viii, 788 pages. Harvard University Press, Cambridge; Heinemann, London 1943 (Loeb Classical Library) \$2.50

**Livy.** MOORE, FRANK GARDNER. Livy, with an English translation. VII. Books XXVI and XXVII. 424 pages, 8 maps and plans. Harvard University Press, Cambridge; Heinemann, London 1943 (Loeb Classical Library) \$2.50

**Marcus Aurelius.** LYTH, JOHN. Selections in a



Verse Rendering. 20 pages. Allen and Unwin, London 1942 2 s.

**New Testament.** GLOVER, T. R. The Mind of St. Paul. 24 pages. Oxford, New York 1942 \$0.75

— The New Testament. A Revision of the Challoner Rheims Version. Edited by Catholic Scholars under the Patronage of the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. 762 pages. St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson 1943

— RATTRY, B. K. The Making of the Synoptic Gospels. 78 pages. Macmillan, New York 1942 \$0.75

— The Gospels According to St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, St. John, with the Old Testament References Printed on Parallel Pages. Arranged by W. WYATT RAWSON. 515 pages. John Howell, San Francisco 1942 \$5

— READ, WILLIAM MERRITT. Michigan Manuscript 18 of the Gospels. A Collation of the University of Michigan Manuscript Number 18 of the Four Gospels (Burdett-Coutts II, 18; Gregory 538; Scrivener 552; von Soden 335). ix, 75 pages, 2 plates. University of Washington Press, Seattle 1943 (University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature, Vol. XI)

**Old Testament.** BRIM, CHARLES J. Medicine in the Bible. 384 pages. Max Reibsen, New York 1943 \$3

— COPPENS, J. The Old Testament and the Critics. Translated from the French by Edward A. Ryan and Edward W. Tribbe. 181 pages. St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson 1942 \$2.50

— FRITSCH, CHARLES T. The Antianthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch. 81 pages. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1943 \$2

**Ovid.** EWALD, SISTER MARIE LIGUORI. Ovid in the Contra Oratorem Symmachi of Prudentius. xiv, 220 pages. Catholic University Press, Washington 1942 (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. 66) \$2

**Pervigilium Veneris.** The Vigil of Venus. Text. Introduction, Translation by ALLEN TATE. unpagged. Cummings Press, Cummington, Mass. 1943

**Seneca.** ALEXANDER, WILLIAM HARDY. Seneca's Dialogi III, IV, V De Ira Libri Tres. The Text Emended and Explained. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1943 (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Volume 12, No. 12, pages 225-54) \$0.25

**Statius.** DEFERRARI, ROY J. and SISTER M. CLEMENT EAGAN. A Concordance of Statius. vi, 926 pages. Catholic University of America, Washington 1943 \$8

#### LITERARY HISTORY. CRITICISM

BROWN, ARTHUR CHARLES LEWIS. The Origin of the Grail Legend. viii, 475 pages. Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1943 \$5

CHERNISS, HAROLD. The Biographical Fashion in Literary Criticism. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1943 (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Volume 12, No. 15, pages 279-92) \$0.25

SMITH, ROY L. How Your Bible Grew Up. 64 pages. Abington-Cokesbury Press, New York 1943 \$0.25

THOMPSON, JAMES WESTFALL and BERNARD J. HOLM. A History of Historical Writing. 2 vols. 693, 683 pages. Macmillan, New York 1942 \$14

WHALL, A. L. The Greek Reader. 933 pages. Doubleday, Garden City 1943 \$5

#### HISTORY. SOCIAL STUDIES

ASCH, SCHOLEM (Shalom). The Apostle. Translated by Maurice Samuel. vii, 804 pages. Putnam, New York 1943 \$3

EFTALOTIS, ARGYRIS. Modern Tales of the Greek Islands. 238 pages. Nelson, London 1942 7/6

FARROW, JOHN. Pageant of the Popes. 420 pages, ill. Sheed and Ward, New York 1943 \$3.50

HOLSAPPLE, LLOYD BURDWIN. Constantine the Great. 494 pages, ill., map. Sheed and Ward, New York 1942 \$3

MACARTHUR, JOHN R. Ancient Greece in Modern America. 395 pages. Caxton Printers, Caldwell, Idaho 1943 \$6

MCCOWN, CHESTER C. The Ladder of Progress in Palestine. 387 pages. Harper, New York 1943 \$3.50

MARKETOS, B. I. Greece at the Crossroad. In Greek. 331 pages, ill. National Herald, New York 1943 \$2

OLSCHI, LEONARDO. Marco Polo's Precursors. ix, 100 pages, map. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 1943 \$1.50

PRAKKEN, DONALD WILSON. Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology. vii, 113 pages. Lancaster Press, Lancaster 1943

PRATT, IDA A. Ancient Egypt, 1925-1941, a supplement to *Ancient Egypt: Sources of Information in the New York Public Library, New York 1925*. 347 pages. New York Public Library, New York 1942 \$2.50

#### LINGUISTICS. GRAMMAR. METRICS

EMENEAU, M. B. A Dravidian Etymology of the Sanskrit Proper Name Nala. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1943 (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Volume 12, No. 13, pages 255-62) \$0.25

STURTEVANT, EDGAR HOWARD. The Indo-Hittite Laryngeals. 103 pages. Linguistic Society of America, Iowa City 1942 (William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series, Volume 9) \$2.25

— Linguistic Change. An introduction to the historical study of language. Reprint edition. 185 pages. Stechert, New York 1942 \$2.50

VAUGHAN, ALDEN GIBSON. Latin Adjectives with Partitive Meaning in Republican Literature. 70 pages. Linguistic Society of America, Iowa City 1942 (Dissertation)

#### PHILOSOPHY. RELIGION. MYTHOLOGY

BREND, WILLIAM A. Sacrifice to Attis. 350 pages. Heinemann, London 1942 6 s.

JAEGER, WERNER. Humanism and Theology. viii, 87 pages. Marquette University Press, Milwaukee 1943 (The Aquinas Lecture 1943) \$1.50

KLAPP, W. H. The Age of Fable, or The Beauties of Mythology, of Thomas Bulfinch, with notes, revisions and additions. 386 pages, ill., map. Heritage Press, New York 1942 \$3.75

#### SCHOOLBOOKS

BROWN, ROBERT T. Modern Latin Conversation. 63 pages. Heath, Boston 1943 \$0.40

LUCAS, HENRY S. A Short History of Civilization. 993 pages. McGraw-Hill, New York 1943 \$4.50